## REMARKS

Claims 28-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 28 is amended and claim 32 is added. Support for the amendments and new claim may be found, for example, in the claims as originally filed; the specification at page 11, line 1 - page 12, line 2; and Fig. 2C. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

#### A. Saito and Shouji

The Office Action rejects claims 28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP 09-043542 to Saito ("Saito") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,820,779 to Shouji et al. ("Shouji"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, "An optical low-pass filter comprising ... a plurality of interfaces of the laminated product each making a predetermined angle, which is more than 0 degrees, relative to an entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter where a light flux enters, wherein each of the interfaces of the laminated product is formed between two laminated sheets of the polymer material and extends diagonally relative to the entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter." The applied references would not have rendered obvious at least the above features of claim 28.

The Office Action asserts that Saito discloses an optical low-pass filter which includes a first and second quartz sheet glued together. *See* Office Action, page 3. The first quartz sheet is cut parallel from a quartz wafer and the second quartz sheet is cut at an angle from a quartz wafer. *Id.* However, the Office Action acknowledges that Saito uses crystal birefringent plates instead of laminated polymer sheets. To address this discrepancy, the Office Action applies Shouji. The Office Action asserts that Shouji discloses that polymer film materials exhibit birefringence properties and result in lighter-weight and thinner low-pass filters when compared with quartz materials. *See* Office Action, page 3. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the polymer film material of Shouji in the optical low-pass filter of Saito. However, Applicants respectfully assert that, even if combined, Saito and Shouji would not have rendered obvious the claimed optical low-pass filter.

Specifically, Saito merely discloses applying (1) a quartz crystal double refractive plate (group 1A) that is almost parallel with an optical axis of the wafer from which it is cut with (2) a quartz crystal double refractive plate (group 2A) that is not parallel with at least one optical axis of the wafer from which it is cut to obtain an optical low-pass filter. *See*, Saito, Abstract and Fig. 1. Saito Fig. 1 is merely a plan view of a quartz crystal wafer W1, a quartz crystal wafer W2, a rectangular quartz crystal double refractive plate group 1A, a rectangular quartz crystal double refractive plate group 2A, an optical low-pass filter group 4A, optical filters 4a, etc. The upper portion in Saito, Fig. 1 and its corresponding text does not disclose a laminated product formed by laminating a plurality of sheets. Rather, Saito merely discloses a quartz crystal wafer W1 and a quartz crystal wafer W2, and cutting the quartz crystal wafer W1 and the quartz crystal wafer W2 to make a plurality of rectangular quartz crystal double refractive plate groups 1A and a plurality of rectangular quartz crystal double refractive plate groups 2A. Plate group 1A and plate group 2A are then placed together, but Saito does not disclose that the plate groups are laminated. Further, Saito does not provide any reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have laminated the plate groups to form a laminate product, much less to have formed a laminated product with a plurality of interfaces each making a predetermined angle, which is more than 0 degrees, relative to an entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter where light flux enters, as recited in claim 28.

In addition, Saito does not disclose that each of the interfaces of the laminated product is formed between two laminated sheets of the polymer material and extend diagonally relative to the entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter, as recited in claim 28. The entrance surface of the optical low-pass filter according to Saito, where light flux enters, is a surface of the optical low-pass filter (4a) that is parallel to the drawing sheet of Fig. 1, and the right or left of the optical low-pass filter (4a) in Fig. 2. Thus, Saito does not disclose at least this feature of claim 28. Further, Saito fails to provide any reason or rationale for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified its optical low-pass filter to have included at least this feature of claim 28.

As discussed above, Shouji is merely applied as allegedly disclosing the use of a polymer and, thus, Shouji does not address the discrepancies of Saito as to the above features of claim 28. Thus, Saito and Shouji, individually or in combination, would not have rendered obvious each and every feature of claim 28.

Claim 28 would not have been rendered obvious by Saito and Shouji, individually or in combination. Claim 30 depends from claim 28 and likewise would not have been rendered obvious. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

### B. Saito, Shouji, Mazaki and Osawa

The Office Action rejects claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saito in view of Shouji and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,578,243 to Mazaki et al. ("Mazaki"), and rejects claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saito in view of Shouji and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,327,085 to Osawa et al. ("Osawa").

For at least the reasons discussed above, Saito and Shouji, individually or in combination, would not have rendered obvious each and every feature of claim 28. Further, Mazaki is merely applied as allegedly disclosing that polymer films for optical filters can be obtained by stretching or "drawing a polymer film." See Office Action, page 4. Osawa is merely applied as allegedly disclosing an optical filter including conductive coatings applied to front and back sides, wherein the conductive coatings prevent dust and lint from adhering to the optical filter. *Id.* Thus, Mazaki and Osawa are not applied to address the above discrepancies of Saito and Shouji as to claim 28. Thus, Saito, Shouji, Mazaki and Osawa, individually or in any combination, would not have rendered obvious each and every feature of claim 28.

Claim 28 would not have been rendered obvious by Saito, Shouji, Mazaki or Osawa, individually or in any combination. Claims 29 and 31 depend from claim 28 and likewise would not have been rendered obvious. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Nicolas A. Brentlinger
Registration No. 62,211

MAC:NAB/jqw

Date: March 9, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**
**P.O. Box 320850**
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461